

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
11 AT TACOMA

12 PRESTON E. RICHARDSON,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 NANCY DAUTH, *et al.*,

16 Defendants.
17

Case No. C06-5727FDB/KLS

ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

18 This civil rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to Title 28
19 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for extension of time.
20 (Dkt. # 22). Defendants' have filed a letter advising the Court that, as there is no provision in the Federal
21 Rules for responding to an answer, the Defendants will not file a response to Plaintiff's motion unless
22 ordered to do so by the court. (Dkt. # 24).

23 Plaintiff states that since April 5, 2007, he has been in IMU, without full access to his legal papers
24 or legal library access. (*Id.*) Therefore, he is not able to properly file a response to Defendants' Answer,
25 which was filed on April 26, 2007. (Dkt. # 21). Defendants' Answer contains no counterclaim and the
26 Court has not ordered that a response to the answer is required. Under these circumstances, the Federal
27 Rules of Civil Procedure do not allow or require the filing of a response to an answer to the Complaint in
28 this case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 7.

1 Accordingly, there is no need for the extension of time sought by Plaintiff and his motion (Dkt. #
2 22) is **DENIED**.

3
4 The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel for Defendants.

5
6 DATED this 23rd day of May, 2007.

7
8
9 

10 Karen L. Strombom
11 United States Magistrate Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28